

Amendments to Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings (Page 2 of 4) includes changes to FIG. 2. This Replacement Sheet, which includes FIGS. 2 and 3, replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 2 and 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 2 of 4 / FIGS. 2 and 3

REMARKS

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejections in the Office Action dated August 17, 2010, claim 1 has been amended. Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the present patent application and allowance of all claims pending herein are respectfully requested in view of the remarks below. Claims 1-11 are now pending.

Initially, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the time granted its undersigned representative on September 21, 2010 in which the Office Action was discussed. The indicated amendments are believed to be in accordance with this conversation and the application is now believed to be allowable.

Drawing Objections:

The drawings stand objected to because the angular spacing α is indicated as not being shown in the claims and such showing is required. Applicant deleted the term " α " from the claims but the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action indicates that the angle spacing should be shown in the drawings. FIG. 2 has been amended to show an angular spacing 100 as requested in the Office Action, and paragraph [0034] of the published application has been amended to correspond to this amendment. Thus, this rejection is believed to be overcome.

FIGS. 2 and 3 have also been amended to represent the drawing amendments from the previous response dated August 11, 2010, wherein the selector was corrected to be 23 and a lower edge thereof was corrected to be 23A, instead of 29 and 29A, respectively, as in the originally filed drawings.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Relative to claim 1, the phrase "the selector device positioned, from a lateral flange of the housing, on an outside and an inside of the housing" is allegedly confusing. It is questioned how


the selector could be located both inside and outside of the flange and is alleged that the operating lever appears to be outside of the flange. Applicant respectfully submits that from a review of FIGS. 2-5 that selector device 23 (previously indicated as 29) is located both on an outside and an inside of a flange. However, claim 1 has been amended to remove the reference to the selector device being positioned on an outside and on an inside of the housing. Accordingly, this rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor A. Cardona, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 44,589

Dated: November 10, 2010

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI, P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579